

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

() Claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 - 13 are presently pending in the application. Claims 5, 12 and 13 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 7 and 15 were previously canceled. Claims 6, 8 and 14 have been canceled, herein.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that item 5 of the above-identified Office Action indicated that claims 1 and 3 were allowed, and that item 4 of the Office Action indicated that claims 8 - 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response to item 4 of the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 5 to include all of the limitations of former claim 8, now canceled. Additionally, claims 12 and 13 were amended to include the limitations of former claim 5. As such, Applicant's claims 1, 3, 5, 12 and 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance, pursuant to items 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

However, Applicant notes that item 4 of the Office Action indicated that claims 9 - 11 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant further notes that, **claims 9 - 11 depend, ultimately, from the allowed**

Applic. No. 09/897,279
Response Dated October 10, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of August 21, 2007

claim 1, and not from any of the rejected claims. As such, because Applicant's claims 9 - 11 depend from an allowed independent claim, it is believed that Applicant's claims 9 - 11 are additionally already in condition for allowance. In light of the above, Applicant respectfully believes that rewriting of claims 9 - 11 is unnecessary at this time.

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 5, 6 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,594,273 to McGibney ("**MCGIBNEY**"). Claim 5 has been amended herein to include the subject matter of claim 8, which was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable. As such, Applicant's claim 5 is now believed to be in condition for allowance, pursuant to item 4 of the Office Action.

Applicant has canceled claims 6 and 14 from the instant application. Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claims 6 and 14 over **MCGIBNEY** has been mooted.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, Applicant's remaining claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Applic. No. 09/897,279
Response Dated October 10, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of August 21, 2007

More particularly, it is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 5, 12 and 13. Claims 1, 5, 12 and 13 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 - 13 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemmer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Applic. No. 09/897,279
Response Dated October 10, 2007
Responsive to Office Action of August 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237

October 10, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Steiner LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101